Message

From: CN=Phil North/OU=R10/O=USEPA/C=US [CN=Phil North/OU=R10/O=USEPA/C=US]
Sent: 9/21/2011 8:31:31 PM
To: "Daniel Schindler" [deschind@uw.edu]
CC: CN=Jim Wigington/OU=COR/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Joe Ebersole/OU=COR/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Richard Parkin/OU=R10/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA; N=Joe Ebersole/OU=COR/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Richard Parkin/OU=R10/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA; N=Richard Parkin/OU=R10/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA
Subject: Salmon population from habitat metrics

Hi Dan,
In my work, to discuss the impacts of a project, we always use some metric of habitat affected and not population. That is because we never have useful population information. Even on big projects like Chuitna Coal or Pebble the fish counts are conducted over too few seasons to provide any useful population information. We don't even consider population metrics in our assessment of a project.

That said I am wondering if you are familiar with simple means to differentiate the value of habitat for salmon in a given stream in the Bristol Bay watershed. Any method would have to work on the type of stream information that can be garnered from a USGS topo map, because that is about all we have. What I am getting at is whether we should treat all habitat the same or, in the circumstance of a spill of some sort around Pebble or on Kaskanak Creek or on the streams west of Koliganek, etc., is there a simple way to say that affecting one part of the stream vs another will result in greater effect on the population.

I hope this is clear.

I talked with Jim about this. He mentioned work on coho in the Oregon Coast Range that gets to this. I am wondering if you have thoughts specific to Bristol Bay and perhaps to sockeye.

Phil

Phillip North
Environmental Protection Agency
Kenai River Center
514 Funny River Road
Soldotna, Alaska 99669
(907) 714-2483
fax 260-5992
north.phil@epa.gov

"To protect your rivers, protect your mountains."